arXiv:1210.6366v1 [math.CO] 23 Oct 2012

On the Summability of Bivariate Rational Functions*

Shaoshi Chen and Michael F. Singer[†] [‡]

October 25, 2012

Abstract

We present criteria for deciding whether a bivariate rational function in two variables can be written as a sum of two (q-)differences of bivariate rational functions. Using these criteria, we show how certain double sums can be evaluated, first, in terms of single sums and, finally, in terms of values of special functions.

1 Introduction

The method of residues has been a powerful tool for investigating various problems in algebra, analysis, and combinatorics [13, 10, 18, 19]. This paper is a further example of the method of residues the authors used in [8]. By focusing on residues, we are able to give a unified approach to problems in the shift and q-shift cases while also identifying where these cases differ.

The general question considered in this paper was raised by Andrews and Paule in [3]:

> "Is it possible to provide any algorithmic device for reducing multiple sums to single ones?"

The single sums are much more easily handled due to the celebrated Gopser algorithm [14] for hypergeometric terms. The Gosper algorithm decides whether a hypergeometric term $T(n)$ is equal to the difference of another hypergeometric term. If such a hypergeometric term exists, we say that $T(n)$ is *hypergeometric summable*. Passing from univariate to multivariate, the first step has been started in the work by Chen et al. in [9]. However, they only obtained necessary conditions for hypergeometric summability of bivariate hypergeometric terms. As a starting point, we focus on the double sums of rational functions. With

---

[*] This work was supported in part by NSF Grant CCF-1017217.

[†] Email Addresses: `schen21@ncsu.edu` (S. Chen), `singer@math.ncsu.edu` (M. F. Singer).

[‡] Corresponding Author: Michael F. Singer, Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Box 8205, Raleigh, NC 27695-8205, `singer@math.ncsu.edu`, Telephone: 919 515 2671, Fax: 919 515 3798

the help of the discrete and q-discrete analogues of usual complex residues in analysis, we derive necessary and sufficient conditions, which allow us to decide whether a rational function in two variables can be written as a sum of two (q-)differences of rational functions.

For a precise description, let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero and $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ be the field of rational functions in x and y over $\mathbb{F}$. Let ϕ and φ be two automorphisms of $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$. A rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$ is said to be (ϕ, φ)-*summable* in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ if there exist $g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$ such that

$$f = \phi(g) - g + \varphi(h) - h.$$

The problem we study is the following.

> **Bivariate Summability Problem.** Given a rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$, decide whether or not f is (ϕ, φ)-summable in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$.

To make the problem more tractable, we will make some restriction on ϕ and φ. We define shift operators σ_x and σ_y in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ as

$$\sigma_x(f(x, y)) = f(x + 1, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_y(f(x, y)) = f(x, y + 1)$$

for all $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$. For $q \in \mathbb{F}\setminus\{0\}$, we define q-shift operators τ_x and τ_y in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ as

$$\tau_x(f(x, y)) = f(qx, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_y(f(x, y)) = f(x, qy) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y).$$

In this paper, we will solve the problem above in two cases: one is that $\phi = \sigma_x$ and $\varphi = \sigma_y$ and the other is that $\phi = \tau_x$ and $\varphi = \tau_y$.

The continuous counterpart, namely *bivariate integrability problem*, traces back to the works by Poincaré [25] and Picard [22]. Let D_x and D_y denote the derivations with respect to x and y, respectively. The problem is to decide whether a rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$ is equal to $D_x(g) + D_y(h)$ for some $g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$. In [22, vol 2, page 220], Picard gave a necessary and sufficient condition, which says that such a pair (g, h) exists for f if and only if all residues of f with respect to y as algebraic functions in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$ are equal to derivatives of other algebraic functions. For a more elementary proof of Picard's criterion and many applications, one can see the paper [7]. So the criteria in this paper can be viewed as a discrete and q-discrete analogue of Picard's criterion.

A gallery of all results can be illustrated by the rational function

$$f = \frac{1}{x^n + y^n}, \quad \text{where } n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}.$$

- The continuous case (Example 5 in [7]):

$$f = D_x(g) + D_y(h) \text{ for some } g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad n \neq 2.$$

- The discrete case (Example 3.8 below):

$$f = \sigma_x(g) - g + \sigma_y(h) - h \text{ for some } g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad n = 1.$$

- The q-discrete case:
  - q is a root of unity with $q^m = 1$ and m minimal (Example 3.13 below):

$$f = \tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h \text{ for some } g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y) \Leftrightarrow n \neq 0 \bmod m.$$

  - q is not a root of unity (Example 3.19 below): For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$f = \tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h \text{ for some } g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y).$$

Using the (q)-summability criteria, we show some identities between double sums and single sums. For instance,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(m + n/2)^3} = 4\zeta(2) - \frac{9}{2}\zeta(3),$$

and

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q^{an} + q^{bn}} = \frac{1}{1 - q^n} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + 2\mathrm{L}_1(-1, 1/q^n) \right)$$

where $\mathrm{L}_1(x, q)$ is the q-logarithm (see Example 3.19).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the notion of discrete residues and their q-analogues, introduced in [8]. In terms of these residues, we review the necessary and sufficient conditions for the summability of univariate rational functions. The importance of discrete residues and their q-analogues lies in reducing the problem of summability of bivariate rational functions to that of summability of univariate algebraic functions. In Section 3, we present a necessary and sufficient condition on the summability of rational functions in two variables and also some examples.

2 Summability problem: the univariate case

Let $\mathbb{E}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. In the next section, we will take $\mathbb{E}$ to be the algebraic closure of the field $\mathbb{F}(x)$. Let $\mathbb{E}(y)$ be the field of rational functions in y over $\mathbb{E}$. Let ϕ be an automorphism of $\mathbb{E}(y)$ that fixes $\mathbb{E}$. A rational function $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ is said to be *ϕ-summable* in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ if $f = \phi(g) - g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{E}(y)$. The goal of this section is to solve the following problem.

Univariate Summability Problem. For a given $\mathbb{E}$-automorphism ϕ of $\mathbb{E}(y)$ and $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$, decide whether f is ϕ-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ or not.

This problem will be reduced into two special summability problems, which have been extensively studied in [1, 23, 21, 4, 17, 8]. It is well-known that ϕ is the linear fractional transformation (see [28, p. 181-182]) uniquely determined by

$$\phi(y) = \frac{ay + b}{cy + d}, \quad \text{where } a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{E} \text{ and } ad - bc \neq 0.$$

Let A denote the matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then the action of A on $\mathbb{E}(y)$ can be naturally defined as

$$A(f(y)) = f\left(\frac{ay+b}{cy+d}\right).$$

Let $A = BJB^{-1}$ be the Jordan decomposition of A over $\mathbb{E}$ with $B \in \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{E})$ and J is one of the following forms:

(i). The shift case:

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \lambda \in \mathbb{E} \setminus \{0\}.$$

In this case, we have $J(y) = y + \frac{1}{\lambda}$. Furthermore, we decompose J into the product $\varphi\sigma\varphi^{-1}$, where $\varphi(y) = \frac{y}{\lambda}$ and $\sigma(y) = y + 1$.

(ii). The q-shift case:

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{E} \setminus \{0\}.$$

In this case, we have $J(y) = qy$ with $q = \lambda/\mu \in \mathbb{E}$.

As in the introduction, we let σ_y, τ_y denote the shift and q-shift operators with respect to y in $\mathbb{E}(y)$, respectively. Let ϕ_1, ϕ_2 be two $\mathbb{E}$-automorphisms of $\mathbb{E}(y)$ such that $\phi_1 = \varphi\phi_2\varphi^{-1}$ for some $\mathbb{E}$-automorphisms φ of $\mathbb{E}(y)$. Then the problem of deciding whether $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ is ϕ_1-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ or not is equivalent to that of deciding whether $\varphi^{-1}(f)$ is ϕ_2-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ or not. According to the discussion as above, any $\mathbb{E}$-automorphism is similar to either the shift operator or the q-shift operator over $\mathbb{E}$. So the **Univariate Summability Problem** can be reduced into the usual summability and q-summability problems. We will discuss those two cases separately.

2.1 The shift case

In this case, we consider the problem of deciding whether a given rational function $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ is equal to the difference $\sigma_y(g) - g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{E}(y)$. We review a necessary and sufficient condition in terms of the discrete analogue of the usual residues in complex analysis from [8].

For an element $\alpha \in \mathbb{E}$, we call the subset $\alpha + \mathbb{Z}$ the *$\mathbb{Z}$-orbit* of α in $\mathbb{E}$, denoted by $[\alpha]$. Two elements α_1, α_2 are said to be *$\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent* if they are in the same $\mathbb{Z}$-orbit, denoted by $\alpha_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha_2$. For a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{E}[y] \setminus \mathbb{E}$, the value

$$\max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \exists\, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{E} \text{ such that } i = \alpha - \beta \text{ and } p(\alpha) = p(\beta) = 0\}$$

is called the *dispersion* of p with respect to y, denoted by $\mathrm{disp}_y(p)$. A polynomial $p \in \mathbb{E}[y]$ is said to be *shift-free* with respect to y if $\mathrm{disp}_y(p) = 0$.

Let $f = a/b \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ be such that $a, b \in \mathbb{E}[y]$ and $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. Since the field $\mathbb{E}$ is algebraically closed, f can be decomposed into the form

$$f = p + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i,j}} \frac{\alpha_{i,j,\ell}}{(\sigma_y^{-\ell}(y) - \beta_i)^j}, \tag{1}$$

where $p \in \mathbb{E}[y]$, $m, n_i, d_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_{i,j,\ell}, \beta_i \in \mathbb{E}$, and β_i's are in distinct $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits. We introduce a discrete analogue of the usual residues for rational functions, which is motivated by the following fact.

Fact 2.1. *Let ϕ be any $\mathbb{E}$-automorphism of $\mathbb{E}(y)$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{E}$. Then for all m, n in $\mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\frac{\alpha}{(\phi^n(y) - \beta)^m} = \phi(g) - g + \frac{\alpha}{(y - \beta)^m}, \quad \textit{where } g = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\alpha}{(\phi^j(y) - \beta)^m}.$$

Definition 2.2 (Discrete residue)**.** *Let $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ be of the form (1). The sum $\sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i,j}} \alpha_{i,j,\ell} \in \mathbb{E}$ is called the* discrete residue *of f at the $\mathbb{Z}$-orbit $[\beta_i]$ of multiplicity j with respect to y, denoted by* $\mathrm{dres}_y(f, [\beta_i], j)$.

We recall a criterion on the summability in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ via discrete residues.

Proposition 2.3 (c.f. Prop. 2.5 in [8])**.** *Let $f = a/b \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ be such that $a, b \in \mathbb{E}[y]$ and $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. Then f is σ_y-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ if and only if the discrete residue* $\mathrm{dres}_y(f, [\beta], j)$ *is zero for any $\mathbb{Z}$-orbit $[\beta]$ with $b(\beta) = 0$ of any multiplicity $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

In terms of discrete residues, we derive a normal form for a rational function in the quotient space $\mathbb{E}(y)/((\sigma_y - 1)(\mathbb{E}(y)))$. Let f be of the form (1). Then we can decompose it into $f = \sigma_y(g) - g + r$, where $g, r \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ and

$$r = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\mathrm{dres}_y(f, [\beta_i], j)}{(y - \beta_i)^j} \quad \text{with } \beta_i\text{'s being in distinct } \mathbb{Z}\text{-orbits.}$$

The condition above on r is equivalent to the condition that the rational function r is proper and its denominator is shift-free with respect to y. Such an additive decomposition can be computed by the algorithms in [1, 2, 21, 23, 24].

2.2 The q-shift case

Let q be an element of $\mathbb{E}$. We consider the problem of deciding whether a given rational function $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ is equal to the difference $\tau_y(g) - g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{E}(y)$.

We first study the case in which q is a root of unity. Assume that m is the minimal positive integer such that $q^m = 1$. We do not assume that $\mathbb{E}$ is algebraically closed but rather only assume that $\mathbb{E}$ contains all m^{th} roots of unity. It is easy to show that $\tau_y(f) = f$ if and only if $f \in \mathbb{E}(y^m)$. Let $p = z^m - y^m \in \mathbb{E}(y^m)[z]$. By the assumption that $\mathbb{E}$ contains all m^{th} roots of unity,

$\mathbb{E}(y)$ is the splitting field of p over $\mathbb{E}(y^m)$. Since $\mathbb{E}$ is of characteristic zero, $\mathbb{E}(y)$ is a Galois extension of $\mathbb{E}(y^m)$ and its Galois group is cyclic and generated by τ_y. We now derive a normal form for rational functions in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ with respect to τ_y.

Lemma 2.4. *Let q be such that $q^m = 1$ with m minimal and let $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$.*

(a) $f = \tau_y(g) - g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ if and only if the trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{E}(y)/\mathbb{E}(y^m)}(f) = 0$.

(b) Any rational function $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ can be decomposed into

$$f = \tau_y(g) - g + c, \quad \textit{where } g \in \mathbb{E}(y) \textit{ and } c \in \mathbb{E}(y^m). \tag{2}$$

Moreover, f is τ_y-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ if and only if $c = 0$.

Proof. (a) This is just a restatement of the additive version of Hilbert's Theorem 90 (see [16, Thm. 6.3, p. 290]).

(b) Since f is algebraic over $\mathbb{E}(y^m)$ and $[\mathbb{E}(y) : \mathbb{E}(y^m)] = m$, we can write f as

$$f = a_{m-1}y^{m-1} + \cdots + a_0, \quad \text{where } a_0, \ldots, a_{m-1} \in \mathbb{E}(y^m).$$

Since $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{E}(y)/\mathbb{E}(y^m)}(y^i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$, the assertion in part (a) implies that $f = \tau_y(g) - g + a_0$ for some $g \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ (alternatively, note that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$, we have $y^i = \tau_y(g_i) - g_i$ with $g_i = \frac{y^i}{q^i - 1}$). So $f - a_0$ is τ_y-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$. For any nonzero element $c \in \mathbb{E}(x^m)$, the trace of c is not zero. So f is τ_y-summable if and only if a_0 is zero. ☐

In this case, we see that it is quite easy to verify the q-summability of rational functions in $\mathbb{E}(y)$.

Now we assume that q is not a root of unity and return to the assumption that $\mathbb{E}$ is algebraically closed. For an element $\alpha \in \mathbb{E}$,, we call the subset $\{\alpha \cdot q^i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of $\mathbb{E}$ the *$q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbit* of α in $\mathbb{E}$, denoted by $[\alpha]_q$. We say α and β are $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-equivalent if $\beta \in [\alpha]_q$ and we write $\alpha \sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \beta$. For a polynomial $b \in \mathbb{E}[y], b \neq \lambda y^n, \lambda \in \mathbb{E}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the value

$$\max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \exists \text{ nonzero } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{E} \text{ such that } \alpha = q^i \cdot \beta \text{ and } b(\alpha) = b(\beta) = 0\}$$

is called the *q-dispersion* of b with respect to x, denoted by $\mathrm{qdisp}_x(b)$. For $b = \lambda y^n$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{E}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we define $\mathrm{qdisp}_y(b) = +\infty$. The polynomial b is said to be *q-shift-free* with respect to y if $\mathrm{qdisp}_y(b) = 0$. Let $f = a/b \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ be such that $a, b \in \mathbb{E}[y]$ and $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. Over the field $\mathbb{E}$, f can be uniquely decomposed into the form

$$f = c + yp_1 + \frac{p_2}{y^s} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i,j}} \frac{\alpha_{i,j,\ell}}{(\tau_y^{-\ell}(y) - \beta_i)^j}, \tag{3}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{E}$, $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{E}[y]$, $m, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ are nonzero, $s, d_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_{i,j,\ell}, \beta_i \in \mathbb{E}$, and β_i's are nonzero and in distinct $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbits. Motivated by Fact 2.1, we introduce a q-discrete analogue of the usual residues for rational functions.

Definition 2.5 (q-discrete residue)**.** *Let $f \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ be of the form* (3)*. The sum $\sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i,j}} \alpha_{i,j,\ell}$ is called the q-*discrete residue *of f at the $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbit $[\beta_i]_q$ of multiplicity j (with respect to y), denoted by* $\operatorname{qres}_x(f, [\beta_i]_q, j)$*. In addition, we call the constant c the q-*discrete residue *of f at infinity, denoted by* $\operatorname{qres}_x(f, \infty)$.

Remark 2.6. *One should notice that the definition of q-discrete residues in [8] is defined via the decomposition*

$$f = c + yp_1 + \frac{p_2}{y^s} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i,j}} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{i,j,\ell}}{(y - q^\ell \cdot \beta_i)^j}, \tag{4}$$

and $\operatorname{qres}_x(f, [\beta_i]_q, j) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i,j}} q^{-\ell \cdot j} \bar{\alpha}_{i,j,\ell}$*. But it is easy to see that $\alpha_{i,j,\ell} = q^{-\ell \cdot j} \bar{\alpha}_{i,j,\ell}$. Therefore, the two definitions coincide. This adjustment will allow us treat discrete residues and their q-analogue in a more similar way.*

The following lemma is a q-analogue of Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 2.7 (c.f. Prop. 2.10 in [8])**.** *Let $f = a/b \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ be such that $a, b \in \mathbb{E}[y]$ and* $\gcd(a, b) = 1$*. Then f is rational τ_y-summable in $\mathbb{E}(y)$ if and only if the q-discrete residues* $\operatorname{qres}_y(f, \infty)$ *and* $\operatorname{qres}_y(f, [\beta]_q, j)$ *are all zero for any $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbit $[\beta]_q$ with $\beta \neq 0$ and $b(\beta) = 0$ of any multiplicity $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

In terms of q-discrete residues, we derive a normal form for a rational function in the quotient space $\mathbb{E}(y)/((\tau_y - 1)(\mathbb{E}(y)))$. Let f be of the form (3). Then we can decompose it into $f = \tau_y(g) - g + r$, where $g, r \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ and

$$r = c + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\operatorname{qres}_y(f, [\beta_i]_q, j)}{(y - \beta_i)^j} \quad \text{with } \beta_i\text{'s being in distinct } q^{\mathbb{Z}}\text{-orbits.}$$

The condition above on r is equivalent to that the rational function $r - c$ is proper and its denominator is q-shift-free with respect to y. Such an additive decomposition can be computed by the algorithms in [1, 2].

3 Summability problem: the bivariate case

In this section, we will view rational functions in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ as univariate rational functions in y over the field $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$. To this end, we need to extend the summability in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ to its algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$. Let ϕ, φ be two automorphisms of $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$. Abusing notation, we still let ϕ, φ denote the arbitrary extensions of ϕ, φ to $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$. An algebraic function $f \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$, is said to be (ϕ, φ)-*summable in* $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$ if there exist $g, h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$ such that $f = \phi(g) - g + \varphi(h) - h$. For a rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$, we will show that the summability in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ and that in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$ are equivalent. To this end, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let k be a field of characteristic zero and let $\overline{k}$ be its algebraic closure and let $\theta : \overline{k} \to \overline{k}$ be an automorphism such that $\theta(k) = k$. Let $\alpha \in \overline{k}$*

and let $K, k \subset K \subset \overline{k}$, be a finite normal extension of k containing α and $\theta(\alpha)$. If $Tr_{K/k}$ denotes the trace, then for $\alpha \in K$

$$Tr_{K/k}(\theta(\alpha)) = \theta(Tr_{K/k}(\alpha)).$$

Proof. Let $P(z) = z^m + p_1 z^{m-1} + \ldots + p_m \in k[z]$ be the minimum polynomial of α over k. Note that $\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\alpha) = -np_1$, where $n = [K : k(\alpha)]$. Furthermore note that the minimum polynomial of $\theta(\alpha)$ is $P^\theta(z) = z^m + \theta(p_1)z^{m-1} + \ldots + \theta(p_m)$. Therefore $\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\theta(\alpha)) = -n\theta(p_1) = \theta(-np_1) = \theta(\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\alpha))$. $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$ and assume that ϕ, φ be two $\mathbb{F}$-automorphisms of $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$. Then f is (ϕ, φ)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$ if and only if f is (ϕ, φ)-summable in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$.*

Proof. The sufficiency is obvious. Conversely, assume that f is (ϕ, φ)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$, that is there exist $g, h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$ such that

$$f = \phi(g) - g + \varphi(h) - h.$$

Let $k = \mathbb{F}(x, y)$ and $\bar{k} = \overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$. Let $K, k \subset K \subset \overline{k}$ be a finite normal extension of k containing $g, h, \phi(g), \varphi(h)$. Applying Lemma 3.1 to $\theta = \phi, \alpha = g$ yields

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\phi(g)) = \phi(\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g)).$$

Similarly we deduce that $\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\varphi(h)) = \varphi(\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(h))$. Therefore, for the integer $N = [K : k]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Nf &= \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\phi(g) - g + \varphi(h) - h) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\phi(g)) - \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g) + \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(\varphi(h)) - \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g) \\ &= \phi(\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g)) - \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g) + \varphi(\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(h)) - \mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(g)$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_{K/k}(h)$ are in k, we have shown that f is (ϕ, φ)-summable in k. $\square$

The following fact, together with Fact 2.1, will be used to simplify the summability problem.

Fact 3.3. *Let ϕ be an automorphism of $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ such that $\phi(y) = y$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$. Then for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\frac{\phi^n(\alpha)}{(y - \phi^n(\beta))^m} = \phi(g) - g + \frac{\alpha}{(y - \beta)^m}, \quad \textit{where } g = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\phi^j(\alpha)}{(y - \phi^j(\beta))^m}.$$

3.1 The shift case

In this case, we consider the problem of deciding whether a given rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$ is equal to $\sigma_x(g) - g + \sigma_y(h) - h$ for some $g, h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$. By Theorem 3.2, this problem is equivalent to that of deciding whether f is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let f be a rational function in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$. Then f can be decomposed into $f = \sigma_x(g) - g + \sigma_y(h) - h + r$, where $g, h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ and r is of the form*

$$r = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{(y - \beta_i)^j} \tag{5}$$

with $\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_i \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, $\alpha_{i,j} \neq 0$, and for all i, i' with $1 \leq i < i' \leq m$

$$\beta_i - \sigma_x^n(\beta_{i'}) \notin \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{6}$$

Moreover, the rational function f is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ if and only if the function $r \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{E} = \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$. According to the discussion in Section 2.1, there exist $\bar{g}, \bar{r} \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ such that $f = \sigma_y(\bar{g}) - \bar{g} + \bar{r}$, where $\bar{r}$ is of the form

$$\bar{r} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{ij}}{(y - \beta_i)^j}$$

with $\bar{\alpha}_{ij}, \beta_i \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and β_i's being in distinct $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits. Assume that for some i, i' with $1 \leq i < i' \leq m$, we have $\beta_i - \sigma_x^t(\beta_{i'}) = s \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since β_i and $\beta_{i'}$ are in distinct $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits, we have $t \neq 0$. By Facts 2.1 and 3.3, there exist $g_{i,j}, h_{i,j} \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ such that

$$\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{i,j}}{(y - \beta_i)^j} - \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{i',j}}{(y - \beta_{i'})^j} = \sigma_x(g_{i,j}) - g_{i,j} + \sigma_y(h_{i,j}) - h_{i,j} + \frac{\sigma_x^{-t}(\bar{\alpha}_{i,j}) - \bar{\alpha}_{i',j}}{(y - \beta_{i'})^j}.$$

This allows us to eliminate a term and we can repeat this process until the β_i's satisfy the condition (6). The remaining equivalence is obvious. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$. If $\beta = \frac{s}{t}x + c$ with $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, $t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\alpha = \sigma_x^t(\gamma) - \gamma$ for some $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, then the fraction $\frac{\alpha}{(y-\beta)^j}$ is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.*

Proof. Let

$$g = \sum_{\ell=0}^{t-1} \frac{\sigma_x^\ell(\gamma)}{(y - \sigma_x^\ell(\beta))^j}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} r = \frac{\alpha}{(y - \beta)^j} - (\sigma_x(g) - g) &= \frac{\alpha}{(y - \beta)^j} - \left(\frac{\sigma_x^t(\gamma)}{(y - \sigma_x^t(\beta))^j} - \frac{\gamma}{(y - \beta)^j} \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha + \gamma}{(y - \beta_j)^j} - \frac{\sigma_x^t(\gamma)}{(y - \sigma_x^t(\beta))^j}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sigma_x^t(\beta) - \beta = s \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\alpha = \sigma_x^t(\gamma) - \gamma$, we have the discrete residue of r at β of multiplicity j is zero. Then Proposition 2.3 implies that there exists $h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ such that

$$\frac{\alpha}{(y-\beta)^j} = \sigma_x(g) - g + \sigma_y(h) - h,$$

which completes the proof. □

We recall a lemma from [8].

Lemma 3.6 (c.f. Lemma 3.7 in [8]). *Let $\alpha(x)$ be an element in the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}(x)$. If there exists a nonzero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sigma_x^n(\alpha) - \alpha = m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\alpha(x) = \frac{m}{n}x + c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{F}$.*

Note that the shift operators σ_x and σ_y preserve the multiplicities of irreducible factors in the denominators of rational functions. Therefore the rational function r in (5) is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ if and only if for each j, the rational function

$$r_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{(y-\beta_i)^j} \tag{7}$$

is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $f \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ be of the form (7) with $\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_i$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, $\alpha_{i,j} \neq 0$, and the β_i's satisfying the condition (6). Then f is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ if and only if for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, we have*

$$\beta_i = \frac{s_i}{t_i}x + c_i, \quad \textit{where } s_i \in \mathbb{Z},\ t_i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, \textit{ and } c_i \in \mathbb{F},$$

and $\alpha_{i,j} = \sigma_x^{t_i}(\gamma_i) - \gamma_i$ for some $\gamma_i \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$.

Proof. The sufficiency follows from Lemma 3.5. For the necessity, we assume that f is (σ_x, σ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$, i.e., there exist $g, h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ such that

$$f = \sigma_x(g) - g + \sigma_y(h) - h. \tag{8}$$

We decompose the rational function g into the form

$$g = \sigma_y(g_1) - g_1 + g_2 + \frac{\lambda_1}{(y-\mu_1)^j} + \cdots + \frac{\lambda_n}{(y-\mu_n)^j}, \tag{9}$$

where $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$, g_2 is a rational function having no terms of the form $1/(y-\nu)^j$ in its partial fraction decomposition with respect to y, $\lambda_k, \mu_k \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, and the μ_k's are in distinct $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits.

Claim 1. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, at least one element of the set

$$\Lambda := \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n, \sigma_x(\mu_1), \ldots, \sigma_x(\mu_n)\}$$

is in the same $\mathbb{Z}$-orbit as β_i. For each $\eta \in \Lambda$, there is one element of $\Lambda \backslash \{\eta\} \cup \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m\}$ that is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to η.

Proof of Claim 1. Suppose no element of Λ is in the same $\mathbb{Z}$-orbit as β_i. Taking the discrete residues on both sides of (8), we get $\operatorname{dres}_y(f, \beta_i, j) = \alpha_{i,j} \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{dres}_y(\sigma_x(g) - g + \sigma_y(h) - h, \beta_i, j) = 0$, which is a contradiction. The second assertion follows from the same argument.

Claim 1 implies that either $\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_1'$ or $\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_1')$ for some $\mu_1' \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$. We shall deal with each case separately.

Claim 2. Assume $\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_1'$.

(a) Fix β_i and $j \in \mathbb{N}, j \geq 2$ and assume that $\sigma_x^{\ell} \beta_i \not\sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq j-1$. Then there exist $\mu_1', \ldots \mu_j' \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\sigma_x^{j-1}(\beta_i) \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_j', \text{ and} \tag{10}$$

$$\sigma_x(\mu_1') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_2',\ \sigma_x(\mu_2') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_3',\ \ldots,\ \sigma_x(\mu_{j-1}') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_j'. \tag{11}$$

(b) There exists $t_i \in \mathbb{N}, t_i \neq 0$ such that $t_i \leq n$ and $\sigma_x^{t_i}(\beta_i) - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. For the smallest such t_i, there exist $\mu_1', \ldots \mu_{t_i-1}' \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\sigma_x(\mu_1') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_2',\ \sigma_x(\mu_2') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_3',\ \ldots,\ \sigma_x(\mu_{t_i-1}') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_{t_i}', \sigma_x(\mu_{t_i}') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i. \tag{12}$$

Proof of Claim 2. (a) Let us first assume that $j = 2$. From the second part of Claim 1, we have that $\sigma_x(\mu_1')$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to an element of $\Lambda \backslash \{\sigma_x(\mu_1')\} \cup \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m\}$. If $\sigma_x(\mu_1')$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to some β_ℓ for $\ell \neq i$, then $\sigma_x(\beta_\ell) \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$, contradicting (6). If $\sigma_x(\mu_1')$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to β_i, then we would have $\sigma_x(\beta_i) \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_i') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$, contradicting the assumption of Claim 2(a). If $\sigma_x(\mu_1') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_\ell)$ for some $\mu_\ell \neq \mu_1'$, then $\mu_\ell \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_1'$, contradiction our assumption that the μ_i are in distinct $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits. Therefore we are left with only one possibility - that $\sigma_x(\mu_1') \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_2'$ for some μ_2' and (10) and (11) hold for this choice. Now assume that (10) and (11) hold for $j > 2$. Arguing as in the case when $j = 2$, we can verify that there exists a μ_{j+1}' such that (10) and (11) hold in this case as well.

(b) If such a t_i does not exist, then one could find $\{\mu_1', \ldots, \mu_{n+1}'\}$ satisfying (10) and (11). In this case, we must have $\mu_r' = \mu_s'$ for some $r > s$ implying that $\sigma_x^r \beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x^s \beta_i$. This implies $\sigma_x^{r-s} \beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$ a contradiction. Therefore the first part of (b) is verified. To verify the second part, apply part (a) to $j = t_i$.

Claim 3. Assume $\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_1')$.

(a) Fix β_i and $j \in \mathbb{N}, j \geq 2$ and assume that $\sigma_x^{\ell} \beta_i \not\sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq j-1$. Then there exist $\mu_1', \ldots \mu_j' \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x^j(\mu_j'), \text{ and} \tag{13}$$

$$\mu_1' \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_2'),\ \mu_2' \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_3'),\ \ldots,\ \mu_{j-1}' \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu_j'). \tag{14}$$

(b) There exists $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_i \leq n$ and $\sigma_x^{t_i}(\beta_i) - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. For the smallest such t_i, there exist $\mu'_1, \dots \mu'_{t_i} \in \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\mu'_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu'_2),\ \mu'_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu'_3),\ \dots,\ \mu'_{t_i-1} \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu'_{t_i}), \mu'_{t_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i. \qquad (15)$$

Proof of Claim 3. (a) Let us first assume that $j = 2$. Again from the second part of Claim 1, we have that μ'_1 is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to an element of $\Lambda \backslash \{\mu'_1\} \cup \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$. If μ'_1 is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to some β_ℓ for $\ell \neq i$, then $\sigma_x(\beta_\ell) \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$, contradicting (6). If μ'_1 is $\mathbb{Z}$-equivalent to β_i, we contradict the assumption of Claim 2. If $\mu'_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu_\ell$ for some $\mu_\ell \neq \mu'_1$, we contradict our assumption that the μ_i are in distinct $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits. Therefore we are left with only one possibility - that $\mu'_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x(\mu'_2)$ for some μ'_2. Therefore (13) and (14) hold in this case as well. Now assume that (13) and (14) hold for $j > 2$. Arguing as in the case when $j = 2$, we can verify that there exists a μ'_{j+1} such that (13) and (14) hold in this case as well.

(b) If such a t_i does not exist, then one could find $\{\mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_{n+1}\}$ satisfying (13) and (14). In this case, we must have $\mu'_r = \mu'_s$ for some $r > s$ implying that $\sigma_x^{-r}\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \sigma_x^{-s}\beta_i$. This implies $\sigma_x^{r-s}\beta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta_i$ a contradiction. Therefore the first part of (b) is verified. To verify the second part, apply part (a) to $j = t_i$.

Using these claims, we now complete the proof. From Claims 2(b) and 3(b), we have that for each i there exists a positive integer t_i such that $\sigma_x^{t_i}(\beta_i) - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that $\beta_i = \frac{s_i}{t_i}x + c_i$ for some $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c_i \in \mathbb{F}$ by Lemma 3.6. We now turn to verifying the claim of the Theorem concerning the $\alpha_{i,j}$.

Fix some β_i and assume, as in Claim 2, that $\beta_i - \mu'_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. We wish to compare the discrete residues at β_i on the left side of (9) with the discrete residues at the elements of Λ on the right side of (9). The equivalences of (12) give the $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits in Λ. In the following table, the first column lists the $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits of elements in Λ. The second column equates the discrete residue of this orbit on the left of (9) with the discrete residue of the same orbit on the right of (9). Note that the orbit listed on the first line corresponds to β_i and that the other orbits have zero residue on the left of (9).

$\mathbb{Z}$-orbit	Comparison of two sides of (9)
$\mu'_1, \sigma_x(\mu'_{t_i})$	$\alpha_{i,j} = \sigma_x(\lambda_{t_i}) - \lambda_1$
$\mu'_{t_i}, \sigma_x(\mu'_{t_i-1})$	$0 = \sigma_x(\lambda_{t_i-1}) - \lambda_{t_i}.$
$\mu'_{t_i-1}, \sigma_x(\mu'_{t_i-2})$	$0 = \sigma_x(\lambda_{t_i-2}) - \lambda_{t_i-1}.$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\mu'_3, \sigma_x(\mu'_2)$	$0 = \sigma_x(\lambda_2) - \lambda_3$
$\mu'_2, \sigma_x(\mu'_1)$	$0 = \sigma_x(\lambda_1) - \lambda_2$

Using the equations in the last column, to eliminate all intermediate terms one can show that $\alpha_{i,j} = \sigma_x^{t_i}(\lambda_1) - \lambda_1$. Since $\beta_i \in \mathbb{F}(x)$, $\mu_1 - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{F}(\mu_1)$, the element λ_1 is actually in $\mathbb{F}(x)$.

We now turn to the situation of Claim 3, that is, assume that $\beta_i - \sigma_x(\mu'_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$. As in the previous paragraph, we will compare the discrete residues at the β_i on the left side of (8) with the discrete residues at the elements of Λ on the right side of (8). The equivalences of (15) give the $\mathbb{Z}$-orbits. The following table summarizes the comparison.

$\mathbb{Z}$-orbit	Comparison of two sides of (9)
$\sigma_x(\mu'_1), \mu'_{t_i}$	$\alpha_{i,j} \ = \ \sigma_x(\lambda_1) - \lambda_{t_i}$
$\sigma_x(\mu'_2), \mu'_1$	$0 \ = \ \sigma_x(\lambda_2) - \lambda_1.$
$\sigma_x(\mu'_3), \mu'_2$	$0 \ = \ \sigma_x(\lambda_3) - \lambda_2.$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\sigma_x(\mu'_{t_i-1}), \mu'_{t_i-2}$	$0 \ = \ \sigma_x(\lambda_{t_i-1}) - \lambda_{t_i-2}$
$\sigma_x(\mu'_{t_i}), \mu'_{t_i-1}$	$0 \ = \ \sigma_x(\lambda_{t_i}) - \lambda_{t_i-1}$

Using the equations in the last column, to eliminate all intermediate terms one can show that $\alpha_{i,j} = \sigma_x^{t_i}(\lambda_{t_i}) - \lambda_{t_i}$. Since $\beta_i \in \mathbb{F}(x)$, $\mu_1 - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{F}(\mu_1)$, the element λ_1 is actually in $\mathbb{F}(x)$. ☐

Example 3.8. *Let* $f = 1/(x^n + y^n)$ *with* $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. *Over the field* $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, *we can decompose* f *into*

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\alpha_i}{y - \beta_i}, \tag{16}$$

where $\beta_i = \omega_i x$ *with* ω_i *varying over the roots of* $z^n = -1$ *and* $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{n(\omega_i x)^{n-1}}$. *By Theorem 3.7,* f *is* (σ_x, σ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ *if and only if for all* $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\omega_i = s_i/t_i$ *for some* $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $t_i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, *and* $\alpha_i = \sigma_x^{t_i}(\gamma_i) - \gamma_i$ *for some* $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{F}(x)$. *When* $n > 1$, *at least one* ω_i *is not a rational number, which implies that* f *is not* (σ_x, σ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$. *When* $n = 1$, *the discrete residue of* f *at* $-x$ *is* 1 *and* $1 = \sigma_x(x) - x$. *Therefore,* $f = 1/(x + y)$ *is* (σ_x, σ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$. *In fact, we have*

$$\frac{1}{x+y} = \sigma_x\left(\frac{x}{x+y}\right) - \frac{x}{x+y} + \sigma_y\left(\frac{-x-1}{x+y}\right) - \frac{-x-1}{x+y}.$$

Example 3.9. *Let* $f = 1/xy$. *The discrete residue of* f *at* 0 *of multiplicity one is* $1/x$. *Since* $1/x \neq \sigma_x(\lambda) - \lambda$ *for any* $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}(x)$, f *is not* (σ_x, σ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$.

Example 3.10. *The harmonic double sums*

$$T(r, s, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^r m^s (n+m)^t}$$

were studied by Tornheim [27, 26] and Mordell [20] and many elegant identities have been established between them [15, 11, 12, 5]. Tornheim [27, Thm. 5] *proved that*

$$T(0,0,t) = \zeta(t-1) - \zeta(t), \quad \text{where } t > 2 \text{ and } \zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}. \tag{17}$$

We give another proof as follows. Let $f = 1/(n+m)^t$. *Let* σ_n, σ_m *be the shift operators with respect to* n *and* m*, respectively. Set* $\Delta_n = \sigma_n - 1$ *and* $\Delta_m = \sigma_m - 1$. *By Lemma 3.5,* f *is* (σ_n, σ_m)*-summable in* $\mathbb{Q}(n,m)$. *In fact, we have*

$$\frac{1}{(n+m)^t} = \Delta_n\left(\frac{n}{(n+m)^t}\right) + \Delta_m\left(\frac{-n-1}{(n+m)^t}\right).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \Delta_n\left(\frac{n}{(n+m)^t}\right) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Delta_n\left(\frac{n}{(n+m)^t}\right)\right)\\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{-1}{(1+m)^t} = 1 - \zeta(t),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \Delta_m\left(\frac{-n-1}{(n+m)^t}\right) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \Delta_m\left(\frac{-n-1}{(n+m)^t}\right)\right)\\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+n)^{t-1}} = \zeta(t-1) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the identity (17).

Example 3.11. *We show the identity*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(m+n/2)^3} = 4\zeta(2) - \frac{9}{2}\zeta(3).$$

By Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\frac{1}{(m+n/2)^3} = \Delta_n\left(\frac{n/2}{(m+n/2)^3} + \frac{(n+1)/2}{(m+(n+1)/2)^3}\right) + \Delta_m\left(\frac{-1-n/2}{(m+n/2)^3}\right). \tag{18}$$

Summing both sides of (18) *with respect to* n *and* m *yields*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(m+n/2)^3} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{-4}{(2m+1)^3} + \frac{-1}{(m+1)^3}\right) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{4}{(n+2)^2}.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2m+1)^3} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^3} - 1 - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2m)^3} = \frac{7}{8}\zeta(3) - 1,$$

which implies

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(m+n/2)^3} = -\frac{7}{2}\zeta(3)+4-\zeta(3)+1+4\zeta(2)-4-1 = 4\zeta(2)-\frac{9}{2}\zeta(3).$$

3.2 The q-shift case

In this case, we consider the problem of deciding whether a given rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x,y)$ is equal to $\tau_x(g)-g+\tau_y(h)-h$ for some $g,h \in \mathbb{F}(x,y)$. By Theorem 3.2, this problem is equivalent to that of deciding whether f is (τ_x,τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.

We first consider the case in which q is a root of unity. Let m be the minimal positive integer such that $q^m = 1$. One can show that $\tau_x(f)=\tau_y(f)=f$ if and only if $f \in \mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)$. Furthermore, $[\mathbb{F}(x,y) : \mathbb{F}(x,y^m)] = m$ and $[\mathbb{F}(x,y^m) : \mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)] = m$ and therefore $[\mathbb{F}(x,y) : \mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)] = m^2$. The field $\mathbb{F}(x,y)$ is a Galois extension of $\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)$ whose Galois group is the product of the cyclic group generated by τ_x and the cyclic group generated by τ_y. We now derive a normal form for functions in $\mathbb{F}(x,y)$ with respect to τ_y and τ_x.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $q \in \mathbb{F}$ be such that $q^m = 1$ with m minimal. Let $f \in \mathbb{F}(x,y)$.*

(a) $f = \tau_x(g)-g+\tau_y(h)-h$ for some $g,h \in \mathbb{F}(x,y)$ if and only if $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(f) = 0$.

(b) Any rational function $f \in \mathbb{F}(x,y)$ can be decomposed into

$$f = \tau_x(g)-g+\tau_y(h)-h+c, \quad \text{where } g,h \in \mathbb{F}(x,y) \text{ and } c \in \mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m). \tag{19}$$

Moreover, f is (τ_x,τ_y)-summable if and only if $c = 0$.

Proof. (a) Assume $f = \tau_x(g)-g+\tau_y(h)-h$. Applying Lemma 2.4(a) to $f-\tau_x(g)-g$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f-(\tau_x(g)-g)) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f) - \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(\tau_x(g)-g). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(\tau_x(g)-g) = \tau_x(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(g)) - \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(g).$$

Therefore

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f) = \tau_x(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(g)) - \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(g).$$

Applying Lemma 2.4(a), we have $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f)) = 0$. Since $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)} \circ \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}$ (see [16, Thm. 5.1, p. 285]), we have $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(f) = 0$.
Now assume that

$$0 = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(f) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f)).$$

Lemma 2.4(a) implies that $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f) = \tau_x(g) - g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{F}(x, y^m)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(mf - \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f)) &= \\ m\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f) - m\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma 2.4(a) implies $mf - \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x,y^m)}(f)) = \tau_y(h) - h$ for some $h \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$. Therefore,

$$f = \frac{1}{m}(\tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h).$$

(b) We can write

$$f = \left(\sum_{0 \leq i,j \leq m-1, (i,j) \neq (0,0)} a_{i,j} x^i y^j \right) + a_{0,0},$$

where all $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}(x^m, y^m)$. A calculation shows that $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(x^i y^j) = 0$ when $0 \leq i, j \leq m - 1, (i, j) \neq (0, 0)$. Therefore part (a) implies that $f = \tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h + a_{0,0}$. Therefore f is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable if and only if the trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}(x,y)/\mathbb{F}(x^m,y^m)}(a_{0,0}) = 0$ but this is true if and only if $a_{0,0} = 0$. □

Similar to the comment following Lemma 2.4(a), one sees that it is easy to verify the (τ_x, τ_y)-summability of any $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$.

Example 3.13. *Let $f = 1/(x^n + y^n)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Recall that m is the minimal positive integer such that $q^m = 1$. Write $n = qm + r$ with $0 \leq r < m$. Then $x^n + y^n = x^r(x^m)^q + y^r(y^m)^q$. This implies that $f \in \mathbb{F}(x^m, y^m)$ if and only if $r = 0$. Since f is nonzero, we have f is not (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ when $r = 0$ by Lemma 3.12. In the case when $r \neq 0$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{x^n + y^n} = \tau_x\left(\frac{c_n}{x^n + y^n}\right) - \frac{c_n}{x^n + y^n} + \tau_y\left(\frac{c_n}{q^n x^n + y^n}\right) - \frac{c_n}{q^n x^n + y^n},$$

where $c_n = q^n/(1 - q^n) = q^r/(1 - q^r)$, which means that f is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ in this case.

From now on, we assume that q is not a root of unity.

Lemma 3.14. *Let f be a rational function in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$. Then f can be decomposed into $f = \tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h + r$, where $g, h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ and r is of the form*

$$r = c + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{(y - \beta_i)^j}, \tag{20}$$

with $c \in \mathbb{F}(x)$, $\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_i \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, $\alpha_{i,j} \neq 0$, $\beta_i \neq 0$ and for all i, i' with $1 \leq i < i' \leq m$

$$\frac{\beta_i}{\tau_x^n(\beta_{i'})} \notin q^{\mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{21}$$

Moreover, the rational function f is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ if and only if the function $r \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{E} = \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$. According to the discussion in Section 2.2, there exist $\bar{g}, \bar{r} \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ such that $f = \tau_y(\bar{g}) - \bar{g} + \bar{r}$, where $\bar{r}$ is of the form

$$\bar{r} = c + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{ij}}{(y - \beta_i)^j}$$

with $c \in \mathbb{F}(x)$, $\bar{\alpha}_{ij}, \beta_i \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and β_i's being in distinct $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbits. Assume that for some i, i' with $1 \leq i < i' \leq m$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\frac{\beta_i}{\tau_x^t(\beta_{i'})} = q^s \in q^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Since β_i and $\beta_{i'}$ are in distinct $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbits, we then have $t \neq 0$. By Facts 2.1 and 3.3, there exist $g_{i,j}, h_{i,j} \in \mathbb{E}(y)$ such that

$$\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{i,j}}{(y - \beta_i)^j} - \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{i',j}}{(y - \beta_{i'})^j} = \tau_x(g_{i,j}) - g_{i,j} + \tau_y(h_{i,j}) - h_{i,j} + \frac{\tau_x^{-t}(q^{-sj}\bar{\alpha}_{i,j}) - \bar{\alpha}_{i',j}}{(y - \beta_{i'})^j}.$$

This allows us to eliminate a term and we can repeat this process until the β_i's satisfy the condition (21). The remaining equivalence is obvious. □

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$. If $\beta = cx^{s/t}$ with $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, $t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\alpha = q^{-sj}\tau_x^t(\gamma) - \gamma$ for some $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, then the fraction $\frac{\alpha}{(y-\beta)^j}$ is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.*

Proof. Let

$$g = \sum_{\ell=0}^{t-1} \frac{\tau_x^{\ell}(\gamma)}{(y - \tau_x^{\ell}(\beta))^j}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} r = \frac{\alpha}{(y-\beta)^j} - (\tau_x(g) - g) &= \frac{\alpha}{(y-\beta)^j} - \left(\frac{\tau_x^t(\gamma)}{(y - \tau_x^t(\beta))^j} - \frac{\gamma}{(y-\beta)^j} \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha + \gamma}{(y - \beta_j)^j} - \frac{\tau_x^t(\gamma)}{(y - \tau_x^t(\beta))^j}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\tau_x^t(\beta) = q^s\beta$. Since $\alpha = q^{-sj}\tau_x^t(\gamma) - \gamma$, we have the q-discrete residue of r at β of multiplicity j is zero. Applying Proposition 2.7, we have that there exists $h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ such that

$$\frac{\alpha}{(y-\beta)^j} = \tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h,$$

which completes the proof. □

We recall a lemma from [8], which is a q-analogue of Lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.16 (c.f. Lemma 3.8 in [8])**.** *Let $\alpha(x)$ be an element in the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}(x)$. If there exists a nonzero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tau_x^n(\alpha) = q^m\alpha$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\alpha(t) = cx^{\frac{m}{n}}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{F}$.*

Note that the q-shift operators τ_x and τ_y preserve the polynomial part and the multiplicities of irreducible factors in the denominators of rational functions. Therefore, the rational function r in (20) is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ if and only if $c \in \mathbb{F}(x)$ is τ_x-summable in $\mathbb{F}(x)$ and for each j, the rational function

$$r_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{(y-\beta_i)^j} \tag{22}$$

is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$.

Theorem 3.17. *Let $f \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ be of the form (22) with $\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_i$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, $\alpha_{i,j} \neq 0$, and the β_i's satisfying the condition (21). Then f is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ if and only if for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, we have*

$$\beta_i = cx^{s_i/t_i}, \quad \text{where } s_i \in \mathbb{Z},\ t_i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, \text{ and } c_i \in \mathbb{F},$$

and $\alpha_{i,j} = q^{-js_i}\tau_x^{t_i}(\gamma_i) - \gamma_i$ for some $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{F}(x^{1/t_i})$.

Proof. The sufficiency follows from Lemma 3.15. The proof of necessity follows the same general lines as the proof of necessity in Theorem 3.7. For the necessity, we assume that f is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$, i.e., there exist $g, h \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}(y)$ such that

$$f = \tau_x(g) - g + \tau_y(h) - h. \tag{23}$$

We decompose the rational function g into the form

$$g = \tau_y(g_1) - g_1 + g_2 + \frac{\lambda_1}{(y-\mu_1)^j} + \cdots + \frac{\lambda_n}{(y-\mu_n)^j}, \tag{24}$$

where $g_1, g_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x, y)}$, g_2 is a rational function with poles having order different from j, $\lambda_k, \mu_k \in \overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, and the μ_k's are in distinct $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbits.

Claim 1. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, at least one element of the set

$$\Lambda := \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n, \tau_x(\mu_1), \ldots, \tau_x(\mu_n)\}$$

is in the same $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbit as β_i. For each element $\eta \in \Lambda$, there is one element of $\Lambda \setminus \{\eta\} \cup \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m\}$ that is $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-equivalent to η.

Proof of Claim 1. The argument is the same as the proof of Claim 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.7, replacing σ_x with τ_x and $\operatorname{dres}_y(f, \beta, j)$ with $\operatorname{qres}_y(f, \beta, j)$.

According to Claim 1, we have either $\beta_i \sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \mu_1'$ or $\beta_i \sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \tau_x(\mu_1')$ for some μ_1' in $\{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$. We shall deal with each case separately. The proofs of the next two claims are essentially the same proofs of the corresponding claims in the proof of Theorem 3.7 after one replaces σ_x with τ_x.

Claim 2. Assume $\beta_i \sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \mu_1'$.

(a) Fix β_i and $j \in \mathbb{N}, j \geq 2$ and assume that $\tau_x^{\ell}\beta_i \not\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \beta_i$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq j-1$. Then there exist $\mu_1', \ldots \mu_j' \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\tau_x^{j-1}(\beta_i) \sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \mu_j', \text{ and} \tag{25}$$

$$\tau_x(\mu'_1)\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_2,\ \tau_x(\mu'_2)\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_3,\ \ldots,\ \tau_x(\mu'_{j-1})\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_j. \tag{26}$$

(b) There exists $t_i \in \mathbb{N}, t_i \neq 0$ such that $t_i \leq n$ and $\tau_x^{t_i}(\beta_i)/\beta_i \in q^{\mathbb{Z}}$. For the smallest such t_i, there exist $\mu'_1, \ldots \mu'_{t_i-1} \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\tau_x(\mu'_1)\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_2,\ \tau_x(\mu'_2)\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_3,\ \ldots,\ \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i-1})\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_{t_i}, \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i})\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\beta_i. \tag{27}$$

Claim 3. Assume $\beta_i\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_1)$.
(a) Fix β_i and $j \in \mathbb{N}, j \geq 2$ and assume that $\tau_x^{\ell}\beta_i \not\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \beta_i$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq j-1$. Then there exist $\mu'_1, \ldots \mu'_j \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\beta_i\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x^{j}(\mu'_j), \text{ and} \tag{28}$$

$$\mu'_1\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_2),\ \mu'_2\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_3),\ \ldots,\ \mu'_{j-1}\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_j). \tag{29}$$

(b) There exists $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_i \leq n$ and $\tau_x^{t_i}(\beta_i) - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. For the smallest such t_i, there exist $\mu'_1, \ldots \mu'_{t_i} \in \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ such that

$$\mu'_1\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_2),\ \mu'_2\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_3),\ \ldots,\ \mu'_{t_i-1}\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\tau_x(\mu'_{t_i}), \mu'_{t_i}\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\beta_i. \tag{30}$$

Using these claims, we now complete the proof. Although the remainder of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.7, there are a few differences so we will give the details.

Fix some β_i and assume, as in Claim 2, that $\beta_i\sim_{q^{\mathbb{Z}}}\mu'_1$, that is $\beta_i = q^{\omega_0}\mu'_1$. From Claim 2(b) we have that $\tau_x(\mu'_k) = q^{\omega_k}\mu'_{k+1}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t_i - 1$ and $\tau_x(\mu'_{t_i}) = q^{\omega_{t_i}}\beta_i$. We can conclude that $\tau_x^{t_i}(\beta_i)/\beta_i = q^{s_i} \in q^{\mathbb{Z}}$, where $s_i = \omega_0+\omega_1+\cdots+\omega_{t_i}$. This implies that $\beta_i = c_i x^{s_i/t_i}$ for some $c_i \in \mathbb{F}$ by Lemma 3.16.

We now wish to compare the q-discrete residues at the β_i on the left side of (24) with the q-disrete residues at the elements of Λ on the right side of (24). The equivalences of (27) yield

$q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbit	Comparison of two sides of (24)
$\mu'_1, \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i})$	$\alpha_{i,j} = q^{-j\omega_{t_i}}\tau_x(\lambda_{t_i}) - q^{j\omega_0}\lambda_1$
$\mu'_{t_i}, \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i-1})$	$0 = q^{-j\omega_{t_i-1}}\tau_x(\lambda_{t_i-1}) - \lambda_{t_i}$
$\mu'_{t_i-1}, \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i-2})$	$0 = q^{-j\omega_{t_i-2}}\tau_x(\lambda_{t_i-2}) - \lambda_{t_i-1}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\mu'_3, \tau_x(\mu'_2)$	$0 = q^{-j\omega_2}\tau_x(\lambda_2) - \lambda_3$
$\mu'_2, \tau_x(\mu'_1)$	$0 = q^{-j\omega_1}\tau_x(\lambda_1) - \lambda_2$

Using the equations in the last column to eliminate all intermediate terms, one can show that $\alpha_{i,j} = q^{-js_i}\tau_x^{t_i}(\lambda) - \lambda$ where $\lambda = q^{jw_0}\lambda_1$.

We now turn to the situation of Claim 3, that is we assume that $\beta_i = q^{-\omega_0}\tau_x(\mu'_1)$. From Claim 3(b), we have that $\mu'_k = q^{-\omega_k}\tau_x(\mu'_{k+1})$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t_i - 1$ and $\mu'_{t_i} = q^{-\omega_{t_i}}\beta_i$. We can conclude that $\tau_x^{t_i}(\beta_i)/\beta_i = q^{s_i} \in q^{\mathbb{Z}}$, where $s_i = \omega_0 +$

$\omega_1 + \cdots + \omega_{t_i}$. This implies that $\beta_i = c_i x^{s_i/t_i}$ for some $c_i \in \mathbb{F}$ by Lemma 3.16.

We now wish to compare the q-discrete residues at the β_i on the left side of (24) with the q-disrete residues at the elements of Λ on the right side of (24). The equivalences of (30) yield

$q^{\mathbb{Z}}$-orbit	Comparison of two sides of (24)
$\mu'_{t_i}, \tau_x(\mu'_1)$	$\alpha_{i,j} \;=\; q^{-j\omega_0}\tau_x(\lambda_1) - q^{j\omega_{t_i}}\lambda_{t_i}$
$\mu'_1, \tau_x(\mu'_2)$	$0 \;=\; q^{-j\omega_1}\tau_x(\lambda_2) - \lambda_1$
$\mu'_2, \tau_x(\mu'_3)$	$0 \;=\; q^{-j\omega_2}\tau_x(\lambda_3) - \lambda_2$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\mu'_{t_i-2}, \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i-1})$	$0 \;=\; q^{-j\omega_{t_i-2}}\tau_x(\lambda_{t_i-1}) - \lambda_{t_i-2}$
$\mu'_{t_i-1}, \tau_x(\mu'_{t_i})$	$0 \;=\; q^{-j\omega_{t_i-1}}\tau_x(\lambda_{t_i}) - \lambda_{t_i-1}$

Using the equations in the last column to eliminate all intermediate terms, one can show that $\alpha_{i,j} = q^{-js_i}\tau_x^{t_i}(\lambda) - \lambda$ where $\lambda = q^{j\omega_{t_i}}\lambda_{t_i}$. Since $\lambda_{t_i} \in \mathbb{F}(x)(\beta_i)$ and $\beta_i \in \mathbb{F}(x^{1/t_i})$, we have $\lambda_{t_i} \in \mathbb{F}(x^{1/t_i})$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 3.18. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}(x^{1/t})$ with $t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. We show how to reduce the problem of deciding whether there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{F}(x^{1/t})$ such that*

$$\alpha = q^m \tau_x^t(\beta) - \beta, \tag{31}$$

to the usual q-summability problem as in Section 2.2. First, set $\bar{x} = x^{1/t}$ and $\bar{\tau}_{\bar{x}} = \tau_x^t$. Then $\bar{\tau}_{\bar{x}}(\bar{x}) = q\bar{x}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}(\bar{x})$ and (31) is equivalent to

$$\alpha = q^m \bar{\tau}_{\bar{x}}(\beta) - \beta \quad \textit{for some } \beta \in \mathbb{F}(\bar{x}).$$

Let $\bar{\beta} = \bar{x}^m \beta$ and $\bar{\alpha} = \bar{x}^m \alpha$. By a direct calculation, we have that $q^m \bar{\tau}_{\bar{x}}(\beta) = q^m \tau_x(\bar{\beta}/\bar{x}^m) = \tau_{\bar{x}}(\bar{\beta})/\bar{x}^m$, which implies that

$$\bar{\alpha} = \tau_{\bar{x}}(\bar{\beta}) - \bar{\beta}.$$

Therefore, we can use the criterion on the q-summability in $\mathbb{F}(\bar{x})$ in Section 2.2 to solve this problem.

Example 3.19. *Let $f = 1/(x^n + y^n)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Over the field $\overline{\mathbb{F}(x)}$, we can decompose f into the form (16). By Theorem 3.17, f is (τ_x, τ_y)-summable in $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ if and only if for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,*

$$\frac{1}{n(\omega_i x)^{n-1}} = q^{-1}\tau_x(\gamma_i) - \gamma_i \quad \textit{for some } \gamma_i \in \mathbb{F}(x). \tag{32}$$

By Remark 3.18, the equation (32) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{n\omega_i^{n-1} x^n} = \tau_x(\bar{\gamma}_i) - \bar{\gamma}_i \quad \textit{for some } \bar{\gamma}_i \in \mathbb{F}(x).$$

By the q-summability criterion in Section 2.2, we have $\frac{1}{n\omega_i^{n-1}x^n}$ *is* τ_x*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x)$ *for all* $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$*. Therefore,* f *is* (τ_x, τ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$*. In fact, we have*

$$\frac{1}{x^n + y^n} = \tau_x \left(\frac{c_n}{x^n + y^n} \right) - \frac{c_n}{x^n + y^n} + \tau_y \left(\frac{c_n}{q^n x^n + y^n} \right) - \frac{c_n}{q^n x^n + y^n}, \quad (33)$$

where $c_n = q^n/(1 - q^n)$*. In order to translate the identity* (33) *into that of usual sums, we define the transformation* $\rho : \mathbb{F}(x, y) \to \mathbb{F}(q^a, q^b)$ *by* $\rho(x) = q^a$*,* $\rho(y) = q^b$ *and* $\rho(c) = c$ *for any* $c \in \mathbb{F}$*. Since* q *is not a root of unity,* ρ *is an isomorphism between two fields* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ *and* $\mathbb{F}(q^a, q^b)$*. Let* σ_a *and* σ_b *denote the shift operators with respect to* a *and* b*, respectively. Then* $\rho(\tau_x(f)) = \sigma_a(\rho(f))$ *and* $\rho(\tau_y(f)) = \sigma_b(\tau_y(f))$ *for all* $f \in \mathbb{F}(x, y)$*. Assume that* $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ *and* $|q| > 1$*. Now the identity* (33) *leads to the identity*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a\geq 1} \sum_{b\geq 1} \frac{1}{q^{an} + q^{bn}} &= \frac{q^n}{1 - q^n} \left(\sum_{b\geq 1} \frac{-1}{q^n + q^{bn}} + \sum_{a\geq 1} \frac{-1}{q^n + q^{(a+1)n}} \right) \\
&= \frac{q^n}{1 - q^n} \left(\frac{-1}{q^n + q^n} + 2 \sum_{a\geq 1} \frac{-1}{q^n + q^{(a+1)n}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{1 - q^n} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + 2\mathrm{L}_1(-1; \frac{1}{q^n}) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } \mathrm{L}_1(x; q) = x \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^a - x}, \quad |x| < |p|, p = q^{-1}.$$

The function $\mathrm{L}_1(x; q)$ *is called the q-logarithm (see [30] and the references in this paper). Moreover, P. Borwein has proved in [6] that* $\mathrm{L}_1(-1; \frac{1}{q^n})$ *is irrational, which implies that the double sum above is also irrational.*

In this way, we reduce double sums into single ones and then evaluate these in terms of values of special functions.

Example 3.20. *A q-analogue of Tornheim's double sums is presented by Zhou et al. in [29], which is of the form*

$$T[r, s, t; \sigma, \tau] = \sum_{n,m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma^n \tau^m q^{(r+t-1)n+(s+t-1)m}}{[n]_q^r [m]_q^s [n + m]_q^t},$$

where $\sigma, \tau \in \{-1, 1\}$ *and* $[n]_q := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} = \frac{q^n-1}{q-1}$*. We consider the special case when* $\sigma = \tau = 1$ *and* $r = s = 0$*. By setting* $x = q^n$ *and* $y = q^m$*, the summand of* $T[0, 0, t; 1, 1]$ *is the rational function*

$$f = \frac{(xy)^{t-1}(q - 1)^t}{(xy - 1)^t}, \quad \text{where } t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}.$$

We show that f *is not* (τ_x, τ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ *for all* $t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$*. The partial fraction decomposition of* f *with respect to* y *is*

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \frac{\alpha_i}{(y - 1/x)^{t-i}}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_i = (q-1)^t \binom{t-1}{i} x^{-(t-i)}.$$

By Theorem 3.17, f *is* (τ_x, τ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$ *if and only if for all* $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, t-1\}$*, we have*

$$\alpha_i = q^{t-i} \tau_x(\gamma_i) - \gamma_i \quad \text{for some } \gamma_i \in \mathbb{F}(x). \tag{34}$$

By Remark 3.18, (34) *is equivalent to*

$$(q-1)^t \binom{t-1}{i} = \tau_x(\bar{\gamma}_i) - \bar{\gamma}_i \quad \text{for some } \bar{\gamma}_i \in \mathbb{F}(x).$$

By the criterion for the q*-summability in Section 2.2, the nonzero constant* $(q-1)^t \binom{t-1}{i} \in \mathbb{F}$ *is not* τ_x*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x)$*, which implies that* f *is not* (τ_x, τ_y)*-summable in* $\mathbb{F}(x, y)$*.*

References

[1] S. A. Abramov. The rational component of the solution of a first order linear recurrence relation with rational right hand side. *Ž. Vyčisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz.*, 15(4):1035–1039, 1090, 1975.

[2] S. A. Abramov. Indefinite sums of rational functions. In *ISSAC '95: Proceedings of the 1995 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 303–308, New York, NY, USA, 1995. ACM.

[3] G. E. Andrews and P. Paule. Some questions concerning computer-generated proofs of a binomial double-sum identity. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 16(2):147–153, Aug. 1993.

[4] J. M. Ash and S. Catoiu. Telescoping, rational-valued series, and zeta functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(8):3339–3358 (electronic), 2005.

[5] A. Basu. On the evaluation of Tornheim sums and allied double sums. *Ramanujan J.*, 26(2):193–207, 2011.

[6] P. B. Borwein. On the irrationality of $\sum(1/(q^n + r))$. *J. Number Theory*, 37(3):253–259, 1991.

[7] S. Chen, M. Kauers, and M. F. Singer. Telescopers for Rational and Algebraic Functions via Residues. In J. van der Hoeven and M. van Hoeij, editors, *Proceedings of ISSAC 2012*, pages 130–137, 2012.

[8] S. Chen and M. F. Singer. Residues and telescopers for bivariate rational functions. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 49(2):111–133, 2012.

[9] W. Y. C. Chen, Q.-H. Hou, and Y.-P. Mu. A telescoping method for double summations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 196(2):553–566, 2006.

[10] G. P. Egorychev. *Integral representation and the computation of combinatorial sums*, volume 59 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs.* American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1984. Translated from the Russian by H. H. McFadden, Translation edited by Lev J. Leifman.

[11] O. Espinosa and V. H. Moll. The evaluation of Tornheim double sums. I. *J. Number Theory*, 116(1):200–229, 2006.

[12] O. Espinosa and V. H. Moll. The evaluation of Tornheim double sums. II. *Ramanujan J.*, 22(1):55–99, 2010.

[13] A. O. Gel′fond. *Residues and their applications.* Mir Publishers, Moscow, 1971. Translated from the Russian by V. M. Volosov.

[14] R. W. Gosper, Jr. Decision procedure for indefinite hypergeometric summation. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 75(1):40–42, 1978.

[15] J. G. Huard, K. S. Williams, and N.-Y. Zhang. On Tornheim's double series. *Acta Arith.*, 75(2):105–117, 1996.

[16] S. Lang. *Algebra*, volume 211 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2002.

[17] L. F. Matusevich. Rational summation of rational functions. *Beiträge Algebra Geom.*, 41(2):531–536, 2000.

[18] D. S. Mitrinović and J. D. Kečkić. *The Cauchy method of residues*, volume 9 of *Mathematics and its Applications (East European Series).* D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1984. Theory and applications, Translated from the Serbian by Kečkić.

[19] D. S. Mitrinović and J. D. Kečkić. *The Cauchy method of residues. Vol. 2*, volume 259 of *Mathematics and its Applications.* Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, serbian edition, 1993. Theory and applications.

[20] L. J. Mordell. Note on a harmonic double series. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 35:401–402, 1960.

[21] P. Paule. Greatest factorial factorization and symbolic summation. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 20(3):235–268, 1995.

[22] É. Picard and G. Simart. *Théorie des fonctions algébriques de deux variables indépendantes. Tome I, II.* Chelsea Publishing Co., Bronx, N.Y., 1971. Réimpression corrigée (en un volume) de l'édition en deux volumes de 1897 et 1906.

[23] R. Pirastu. Algorithms for indefinite summation of rational functions in maple. *The Maple Technical Newsletter*, 2(1):29–38, 1995.

[24] R. Pirastu and V. Strehl. Rational summation and Gosper-Petkovšek representation. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 20(5-6):617–635, 1995. Symbolic computation in combinatorics (Ithaca, NY, 1993).

[25] H. Poincaré. Sur les résidus des intégrales doubles. *Acta Math.*, 9(1):321–380, 1887.

[26] L. Tornheim. A double series summed geometrically. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 57:535–538, 1950.

[27] L. Tornheim. Harmonic double series. *Amer. J. Math.*, 72:303–314, 1950.

[28] S. H. Weintraub. *Galois theory.* Universitext. Springer, New York, second edition, 2009.

[29] X. Zhou, T. Cai, and D. M. Bradley. Signed q-analogs of Tornheim's double series. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136(8):2689–2698, 2008.

[30] W. Zudilin. Approximations to q-logarithms and q-dilogarithms, with applications to q-zeta values. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, 322(Trudy po Teorii Chisel):107–124, 253–254, 2005.